

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
& ENERGY COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A meeting of the Economic Development and Energy committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held at the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, NY 11787 on Monday, **April 22, 2002** in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium at 10:30 A. M.

Members Present:

Legislator Jon Cooper, Chairman
Legislator Fred Towle, Vice Chairman
Legislator Allan Binder, Member
Legislator Vivian Fisher, Member
Legislator George Guldi, Member

Also in Attendance:

Paul Sabatino, Counsel to the Legislature
Nicole DeAngelo, County Executive's Office
Barbara LoMoriello, Aide to Legislator Cooper
Carolyn Fahey, Suffolk County Economic Development
Gordian Raacke, CAP
Robert Garfinkle, Suffolk County Department of Law
Bill Shannon, Suffolk County Dept. of Public Works
Kevin Duffy, Budget Review Office
Eben Bronfman, Aide to Legislator Guldi
B.J. McCartan, Aide to Presiding Officer Tonna
All other interested parties.

Minutes taken by:

Eileen Schmidt, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 10:37 A. M.)

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

The April 22nd meeting of the Economic Development and Energy Committee, Legislator Binder if you could lead us in the Pledge, please.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Before we get to the agenda we have no speakers, but Gordian Raacke would like to address the committee and make a presentation on a couple of issues, Gordian good morning.

MR. GORDIAN:

Good morning, Chairman and the members of the committee; thank you for letting me speak. Just very briefly, I wanted to make you aware of two issues, two recent developments, one, being the fact that the New York State Assembly's Energy Committee and Committee on Corporations held a public hearing where Richard Kessel was invited to testify among other people and what was stunning to me at the hearing which I attended was that the chairman seemed to when he was pressed on the issue, on the question of LIPA's energy master plan once again the chairman said that LIPA had an energy master plan even though he did not submit a copy of it at the hearing. But the most stunning statement that I actually heard there from the chairman was that he essentially was telling the committee that LIPA will compile an energy plan, but he frankly, believes that such a plan is

worth very little the moment it comes out. So I was shocked to hear that and I wanted you to be aware of that fact because in a way I think it indicates the quality we can expect from LIPA's energy master plan once it is completed.

He also stated, and this is somewhat of a revelation to me as well that when he was asked how much LIPA is planning to spend or spending on this plan he said, they've hired consultants Stone and Webster. They've hired the consultants and they're paying them a sum of \$25,000 for this plan, which I found very surprising given that LIPA has an energy -- an annual budget of \$2.5 billion and makes decisions ranging in hundreds of millions of dollars. This is a 10 year plan and LIPA is spending \$25,000 on that plan. So again, that makes me very concerned about the quality that we can expect from that plan.

The other issue I wanted you to be aware of is today, actually at 11 o'clock today, LIPA is issuing the study that was done on offshore wind study that has looked at the potential for siting wind generators off the shore of Long Island and I have been able to take a look at a copy of that study. I have not read through it completely; I will compile a summary of it for you at a later point, but it is very promising in that the report finds the study finds that and major portion of the Island's electric capacity could actually be generated off the South Shore on the ocean side depending on what perimeters you assume anywhere between two and I believe up to 5,000 megawatts of wind generating capacity exist out there. And the report talks about major projects of at least 100 megawatt in size or larger that could be sited out there in a relatively cost effective manner. So more on that report later; that report is only being released today at 11 o'clock at a press conference, but again, I wanted you to be aware of that.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Did Chairman Kessel provide any target date for release of the master plan? When he had addressed the special -- energy meeting about a month or so ago he had reiterated that they were working on the plan and as soon as it was completed he would be pleased to come back before this committee and present it formally. Did he give you any indication as to when that might be forthcoming?

MR. RAACKE:

Yes, he -- I'd have to go back to my notes, I believe, he said end of May or June.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Fisher, do you have a question?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Yes. Gordian Raacke I have two questions, the first one is regarding the master plan because I had read something about the testimony before the State Legislators and I recall there was one remark by one State Legislator where he was surprised -- I'm sorry I'll just hold the mike that way I can hold it closer to my mouth. Gordian, if Mr. Kessel has indicated that they do have a master plan, okay, there has been an indication that there already exist a master plan then is it a master plan that has already been presented by that consultant or why have they just hired a consultant if there already exist a master plan?

MR. RAACKE:

Well, his explanation is that the existing plan that LIPA has is not comprehensive enough. I think what he refers to when he refers to the existing plan is the 25 page or presentation the --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

-- that short document that we've seen --

MR. RAACKE:

-- Power Point presentation that he's presented to the Legislature and to others. So I think that's what he refers to.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay.

MR. RAACKE:

The plan that is to be compiled by Stone and Webster essentially from what he has told us in previous meetings would consist of a compilation of other existing documents mainly and a summary of those documents.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

My second question is regarding the wind generators; I just read this past weekend a report regarding the wind plan up in Massachusetts and they experienced some opposition from people in Nantucket regarding the environmental impact on the vibration on shellfish life and furthermore the tourist industry -- what do you think will be the reaction or would be the reaction here. I would assume it would be a similar reaction.

MR. RAACKE:

Well, I certainly think that the main obstacle to siting wind projects on Long Island is not going to be the technologies. They're no question that we have the technology available now to do this. The cost is not the question, that seems to be coming down to a point where it becomes cost effective, but --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

-- in Massachusetts it's producing over 400 megawatts so that's sizable.

MR. RAACKE:

Yeah. I think the main question is public acceptance and as with anything that's new people are initially skeptical of it and once they see that it, you know, that they can live with it it's a different story, but I'm sure there's going to be some public opposition to this that's unavoidable. I think we and others have to do a good job of explaining what this technology can do and that ultimately it comes down two choices. No matter what you do every power generating technology has certain impacts some of them negative. The question is really which one you chose over other ones and certainly wind has a aesthetic impacts for some people and maybe other impacts that we'd have to deal with, but ultimately, I think, it comes down to choice of what is the best technology to meet our growing population power needs.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

And I appreciate that the sustainable energy alliance does keep us abreast of what's going on as far as the production of sustainable energy and I assume that they'll keep a close watch on what's going on with that wind siting and how those issues are addressed. It's a good model for us because it's a very similar venue for it.

MR. RAACKE:

Absolutely.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Thank you, Gordian.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Thank you very much, Gordian. Now I'd like to move to the agenda and I will start with the tabled resolutions.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS:

1050. Authorizing retrofitting of traffic lights and LED fixtures. (Cooper) I make a motion to table.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? Resolution is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0)**

1290. To study use of environmentally sensitive fuel for County fleet. (Postal)

LEGISLATOR TOWLE:

Motion to approve.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? IR 1290 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0)**

Sense 4-02 (Non P) - Memorializing Resolution Requesting State of New York to Authorize Lottery for Suffolk County (Cooper) Once again, motion to table.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? Resolution is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS:

1478. Amending the 2002 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with reimbursement to LIPA for relocation of Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) facilities on Suffolk County Construction Projects (CP 5000). PRIME (Co. Exec.)

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Could we have an explanation?

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Explanation just in time.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

What's going on here?

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Could we have a explanation on 1478 please, Paul.

MR. SABATINO:

I have questions in my notes as well because basically Public Works is asking for money to reimburse LIPA for, you know, work that's taking place where there's a displacement of a, you know, a County facility in as County right of way and my understanding is that we have exclusive rights and that everybody's secondary to us if it's in a County right of way. So there maybe details I'm not aware of, but I don't know why we're -- I just had questions to ask questions of the committee because I don't know the answer.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Well, what do you know? We looked up and there you were.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Can we do this project by project and you tell us specifically what's going on? I'm looking at a list of four projects.

MR. GARFINKLE:

The legislative Counsel is absolutely correct, when Lilco was the owner --

MS. SCHMIDT:

Your name for the record.

MR. GARFINKLE:

Robert Garfinkle, Suffolk County Department of Law.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

He's a regular.

MR. GARFINKLE:

When Lilco owned the utility franchise under common law any municipally incurred relocation or relocations incurred as a result of a municipality performing its' governmental function doing road widening work, drainage work and the like, the cost of such relocation of the utility facilities was the obligation of the franchise utility namely, Lilco. Equally accurate is that when there is a public authority that owns utilities and there necessitated to be moved at the request of another municipality then the requesting municipality has to bear the cost and that there are two competing public entities.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

What's the basis for that distinction, is it statute?

MR. GARFINKLE:

It's case law that came out, number one under the way the statute is written the implication is that it's the only for private utilities; PSC regulated utilities. Number two, there's a higher court case that came out of Nassau County which a number of years ago involving a water authority in the County of Nassau and there were two competing public entities; Nassau requested that utilities be moved and the court upheld that --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Do you have a copy of the case and the statute with you?

MR. GARFINKLE:

I got it back at the office; I'll get them over to all of you I didn't bring it with me. It's a reasonably -- it's not that old a case if I remember correctly. The original position of Suffolk County, the Department of Law is that when Lilco acquired or when LIPA acquired the franchise rights of the Long Island Lighting Company or Lilco that it took all of its' assets and liabilities, all of its' burdens in fulfilling its' franchise except those which were specifically excluded by the LIPA act and the LIPA legislation which legislation did not exculpate in our opinion LIPA's authority to transfer these back to Suffolk County. LIPA disagreed with us; they were relying heavily on the Nassau case.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

All right. Could you come back up one step, clarify? The LIPA takeover statute was silent on this issue, is that what you're saying?

MR. GARFINKLE:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

It did not address it; it was silent.

MR. GARFINKLE:

It did not address it. In fact, I would even go one step further. I would say that all of the responsibilities of LIPA were passed -- of Lilco were passed on to LIPA and I would argue if we went into court that one of those responsibilities is to pay the relocation costs you inherited that obligation. LIPA disagrees with it. LIPA says, we're a public entity. Why, you're dealing with ratepayers versus taxpayers and that they believe that they owe nothing. From a practical matter we've got a lot of capital projects coming down the road. There's a release and Mr. Shannon can go into it in more detail. A lot of federal funding that's becoming available. We've got a lot of road projects coming up and a lot of relocation costs that can go into the millions of dollars. What we in analyzing the case I think Suffolk has some very good arguments. I also think that LIPA has some good arguments and that in

the spirit of trying to resolve this we had proposed several things, number one, to avoid litigation subject to coming before that we would split on a 50-50 basis the cost of the relocation. In determining the cost of the relocation we would have entered into an agreement that if we disagreed with the relocation cost we could go into an expedited arbitration process so that we wouldn't be financing LIPA's budget through our relocation cost over and above that which was legitimate. That's basically it in a nutshell.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So although you're presenting us with this resolution you're trying to resolve it --

MR. GARFINKLE:

Yes. We're trying to resolve it --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

-- through a settlement with LIPA so that cost is shared?

MR. GARFINKLE:

To avoid litigation, yes. Instead of us paying zero we would pay 50%, but if LIPA -- but if we litigated it instead of paying 100% we would only pay 50%.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

But the long-term cost of this are unlimited. This goes on forever and could --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Every time there's a project.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

-- and over the next 20 years could be literally hundreds of millions of dollars.

MR. GARFINKLE:

Or double that amount.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Or double that amount.

MR. GARFINKLE:

Or double that amount.

MR. SABATINO:

Okay. I just need to check out one other point. In my abbreviated version I just left out two concerns which maybe just factual at this point. My recollection from the old days was that there were either easement agreements or license agreements or some kind of a document that allowed Lilco access to build its' facilities in certain places and I thought that language from those agreements really is what controlled situation to our advantage; in which case if LIPA took over they'd be taken subject to whatever those agreements were. And the other thing was I thought that there were road opening permits that were issued by Public Works which in the course of issuing those had certain terms and conditions. So really the thrust of my concern that I was raising was that I just wanted to be sure we weren't agreeing to make payments that were in contravention of those documents cause that would be our strongest position quite frankly separate and apart from the common law doctrine, but I don't know if those documents no longer exist or they --

MR. GARFINKLE:

Road opening permits are for the road openings and when the road was opened and complied with the permit ceases. With respect to the utility easements they give Lilco or the successor the right of way to put certain utilities in certain areas that would otherwise be private property. Generally, it's not the governmental property it's usually the private property, but they have easements also in our right of ways I think also.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I have a follow-up question.

MR. SABATINO:

Only because I got involved in this issue along time ago admittedly a lot of time has gone by, but when I was involved there were documents and Lilco had to abide by those documents. Now maybe they didn't cover every relocation location situation in the County, but they involved a lot in the situation that I was dealing with and the documents who had gave the County the ability to say separate and apart from whatever you think the common law theory is this agreement says --

MR. GARFINKLE:

Two things, number one, --

MR. SABATINO:

-- you better be sure those agreements are not being over looked.

MR. GARFINKLE:

I'm not sure whether the -- I haven't look at the agreements, but whatever the agreements are they would have been entered into with the assumption that under the common law to the extent that there is a financial liability imposed upon Lilco that it was based upon those financial liabilities imposed by common law. To the extent that those liabilities whether they be through the documents or through and to me the stronger of the language would be the LIPA statute being silent on relocation costs number one and number two with respect to acquiring the responsibilities of LIPA in providing the services so forth and so on that Lilco previously had. I think there is a very good argument that they would be liable. We're dealing with a significant sum of money; I can certainly with the suggestion limited to a period of five years and we could renegotiate it later on.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

No.

MR. GARFINKLE:

If you're not interested in going forward with it all I'm telling you is that while we may win whatever our liability is under this agreement it would be doubled.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Question. Two questions. What have we done with relocation projects to-date? Obviously, we've had relocation projects throughout Public Works projects.

MR. GARFINKLE:

We've been negotiating, we've been holding off and now what we wanted to do was get the authorization to formalize it because we've --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Okay. So to-date we haven't paid anything to LIPA, is that correct?

MR. GARFINKLE:

That's correct.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Okay. Question, number two, what's LIPA in Nassau County doing?

MR. GARFINKLE:

We have -- a very legitimate question. Very legitimate and I'm not saying this --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

And isn't there a little bit of a conflict there?

MR. GARFINKLE:

No, there's not.

MR. SABATINO:

Kessel's negotiating for both sides, which is a direct conflict.

MR. GARFINKLE:

It is not.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay. I'd like to hear the answer.

MR. GARFINKLE:

They have not been able to get anything out of Nassau County for a host of reasons not the least of which -- okay, are the obvious -- there was an election coming up with the prior administration with the new administration. One of the concerns that we had was that Suffolk would be placed in a prejudicial position; that we would enter into an agreement and that someone would get a more favorable terms and conditions. One of the things that we have in our contract is a most favored nation clause that is retroactive to the extent that there is any agreement on more favorable terms to LIPA that retroactively to the time of such agreement it would be {inord} to the benefit of the County.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Yeah, but let's face it the more beneficial it costs us -- if it costs us X dollars per mile, foot or whatever to relocate LIPA facilities in Suffolk County the relocation cost in Nassau County could be any other number and the most favored treatment clause would become irrelevant because the cost estimates for relocation are done on a project by project basis between DPA and LIPA. So I don't see that clause as providing an iota --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Excuse me, George. I'm not an attorney and so I didn't understand the answer to your question. What's it costing Nassau?

MR. GARFINKLE:

Right now they have no agreement with Nassau and what --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So it's not costing Nassau anything.

MR. GARFINKLE:

I think Nassau is in the same position; they're about to say we are not going to relocate anything if you don't pay us and Mr. Shannon is here. We have dragged this on trying to get the most favorable terms in an agreement. It's going to come to a position where we're going to end up going into court in all probability and trying to get this done. And it's going to be up to a court to decide to do we have to pay money up front, is it going to be held in escrow, things like that and if you want to get into the specific tragedies we can go into executive session, but it's something that we've discussed it at the highest levels with LIPA. I think Nassau County is in a more precarious position because of their finances, they don't want to pay a nickel. I think what LIPA is hoping to do and I'm speculating to a degree as having an agreement in place with Suffolk and they would say to Nassau now we've got a basis for not moving your poles or our poles if you don't sign an agreement.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So we would establish the precedent here for them.

MR. GARFINKLE:

I think that's one of the things that they're hoping to do or cut Nassau off and that's why I was very cautious about putting in a what's called a most favored nation clause that to the extent that any other municipality or entity is treated more favorably than Suffolk retroactive to that more favorable treatment we would be rebated effectively on the cost that we were

paying.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Again, I'm not an attorney and I'm still confused about something. Why would we if you're still negotiating and trying to arrive at terms and conditions that are favorable to us, why do we have a resolution before us?

MR. GARFINKLE:

The negotiations are over at this point. I mean, we're coming to you to authorize us to enter into an agreement.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So negotiations are over and they're saying you have to pay the full price --

MR. GARFINKLE:

And not we're coming to you to present funding for authorizing the agreement.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

And so then we're bearing the full cost?

MR. GARFINKLE:

We'd be bearing 50% of the cost.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

This is 50% of the cost?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Of these four projects, but it goes on forever. Let me tell you, I'm going to make a motion to table because I want to see the following information before we have an executive session and then I'd like to have an executive session. I want to see the statutory basis for the claim against Suffolk County. I want to see the case law that is the product of your research that supports a distinction if between a public authority utility and a private utility.

MR. GARFINKLE:

I have that in the office, should I fax that to you or here and it will be distributed. How do you want it?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I think everyone should look at it, but I'm telling you what I want to see. I want to see a draft of the agreement, the proposed agreement and I want to see some projected financial costs on a annualized basis at least for, you know, for the existing capital budget. What are we looking at in overall cost here? Also I'd like to see an analysis of the extent to which if any that ISTEA or other money is going to be available for reimbursement of these expenses in the event that we decide to incur them voluntarily or that we are ultimately adjudicated to be responsible for them.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Shouldn't we also see the easement agreements?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Well, the easements are going to be problematic because now you're looking at 10,000 pieces of paper because they're property specific.

MR. SABATINO:

Well, it would be significant to know though is whether or not the agreements exist because if they exist LIPA's took subject to them. If they were binding agreements my memory and recollection is correct. Maybe they don't cover every road, but Public Works should certainly know what its got in existence because this is, I mean, this had to come up on the record.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

And it would have an impact on that financial projection as well.

MR. SABATINO:

More importantly it effects the legal issue because the case law can't break a contractual agreement if in fact there is one. If LIPA took Lilco it took it over subject to whatever existing agreements were and I believe that they're agreements out there, but if I'm wrong then at least we should know before we enter into it what the status of whatever roads we had agreements with Lilco is.

MR. GARFINKLE:

We'll get whatever information available. I'm speaking with Mr. Shannon and what would be suggested if at all possible if we could reconvene or if the Legislature would reconvene this committee within a short period of time we'll get the information to you because this has the impact of affecting our capital projects if we go into litigation. So whatever your decision is is fine, but I think it ought to be -- we'll be able to fully review it with what you want --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Well, the cycle we're on is three weeks anyway and I don't know how fast you can prep the financial projects that we just asked for, but I presume it's going to take you more than a couple of hours. I'd still like, even in microcosm, just for a sample of what we're talking about here; could you describe on the four projects that are attached to the existing legislation, can you Mr. Shannon briefly describe physically what the project is; how much and what type of impact on LIPA it has and what the proposed half, you know, what the \$455,000 cost is going to cover half of?

MR. SHANNON:

Very good. My name is Bill Shannon and I'm with Suffolk County Public Works. The first project on the list is the replacement of the Park Avenue culvert and that particular project the LIPA had to stop the lines, they had to breakdown the lines and re-feed the neighborhoods on either side of the culvert in order for us to bring in a crane necessary to drive the sheet piling in. So that work was primarily de-energizing the lines; relocating them out of the way and then bringing them back on to line when the culvert was completed.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

How much line was involved in -- how many cables and how much line?

MR. SHANNON:

That was approximately 300 feet of normal distribution cable.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

It would be 13,200 volt line or 33,000 volt line?

MR. SHANNON:

It was a 33,000 volt line.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

And so it a three line system 300 feet; so it's 900 feet of cable.

MR. SHANNON:

Approximately, yes.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

One disconnect, one reconnect.

MR. SHANNON:

Correct.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

For 10 -- our half of that is 10,000?

MR. SHANNON:

That's correct.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

That's outrageous, that's insane. The cable cost assume that there's not scrap value in what you're dropping can't be more than a couple of dollars a foot. The labor cost, what did it take, 10 men a day? How do you get to \$20,000?

MR. SHANNON:

I can easily come back with that with those detailed number for you.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Yeah. I would love to see that cause that – I mean, that's precisely the concern I have about entering this morass.

MR. SHANNON:

Right.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

That's the kind of detail I'm going to want to look at. I don't see a price justification on what you just described, no even remotely.

MR. SHANNON:

Well, if you'd like we can I can bring back the actual estimates; I'm not going to be able to answer your questions in detail.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Obviously, I'm requiring more specification than you could have reasonably prepared for today, but yeah, that's the kind of detail I'm going to want to look at cause I'm very, very, very uncomfortable with this entire situation. I'm not comfortable with the legal claim at all and I'm certainly not comfortable with what I just heard about the first project. Since I'm going to want the excruciating detail why don't you – those estimates are public documents, why don't you provide those before our next public meeting and then we can to the extent that we have an opportunity to analyze that stuff take up the litigation issues in exec. session where they appropriately should be addressed. I'll restate my motion to table.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? IR 1478 is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0)**

MR. GARFINKLE:

When is the next scheduled meeting for this committee?

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

May 13th I believe.

MR. GARFINKLE:

And the next legislative meeting is –

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Would be eight days after that 13 and 8 is 21.

MR. GARFINKLE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

Thank you. Moving on to

Sense 32-2002 (P) - Memorializing Resolution requesting State of New York to provide funding for the Citizens Advisory Panel (CAP) (Cooper) I'll make a motion to approve.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN COOPER:

All those in favor? Opposed? Sense 32 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0)** And that's all we've got. Thank you very much. This meeting is adjourned.

(Having no further business the Economic Development and Energy Committee was adjourned at 11:08 A.M.)

{ } denotes spelled phonetically.